

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed July 5, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 1 and 11. Additionally, Applicants add new Claims 21-31, which are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Applicants also cancel claims 4 and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants previously canceled Claims 19 and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully note that, with respect to all cancellations and amendments herein, Applicants reserve the right to pursue broader subject matter than that presently claimed through the filing of continuations and/or other related applications. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that Claims 4 and 6-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants amend Claim 1 to include elements of Claim 4 that the Examiner indicates would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 is thus allowable in accordance with the Examiner's indications. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 and its dependents.

Additionally, as discussed further below, Applicants add new Claims 21 and 27 which include elements of Claims 6 and 11, respectively, which the Examiner indicates would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 21 and 27 are thus allowable in accordance with the Examiner's indications. Applicants respectfully request consideration and full allowance of Claims 21 and 27, and their respective dependents.

Consideration of Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicates that the information disclosure statement filed 10/9/01 filed originally was a duplicate and that the IDS filed on 2/20/2002 has been considered.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for various informalities. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as the Examiner fails to specify any statutory or other

appropriate basis for these objections. Nonetheless, for the purposes of advancing prosecution, Applicants amend the specification, as indicated above, thereby obviating the Examiner's objections.

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner indicates that the Oath/Declaration was not received with the application and requested appropriate action be taken to provide it. Attached to this Response is a copy of the Response to Notice to File Missing Parts with attached executed Declaration and Power of Attorney that was filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on January 16, 2002. The attached Declaration and Power of Attorney is a copy of the one originally filed in the parent case of this continuation application as provided in 37 C.F.R. § 1.63(d). Also attached is a copy of the return post card that indicates the Response to Notice to File Missing Parts and the copy of the executed Declaration and Power of Attorney were received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on February 12, 2002.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-18 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,558. Applicants respectfully file herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. As a result, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-18.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,366,558 issued to Howes et al. ("*Howes*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,713,017 issued to Lin et al. ("*Lin*"). Claim 3 depends from Claim 1 which has been shown above to be allowable. Claim 3 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 3, as noted above.

The Examiner rejects Claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howes* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,491,694 issued to Oliver et al. ("*Oliver*"). Claims 14 and 15 depend from Claim 1 which has been shown above to be allowable. Claims 14 and 15 are thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 14 and 15, as noted above.

The Examiner rejects Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howes* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,622 issued to Monteiro et al. ("*Monteiro*"). Claim 16 depends from Claim 1 which has been shown above to be allowable. Claim 16 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 16, as noted above.

The Examiner rejects Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howes* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,020 issued to Beeler, Jr. ("*Beeler*"). Claim 17 depends from Claim 1 which has been shown above to be allowable. Claim 17 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 17, as noted above.

New Claims

Applicants add new Claims 21-31. Claims 21 and 27 include elements of original Claims 4 and 11 that the Examiner indicates are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references. Claims 21 and 27 are thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request consideration and full allowance of Claims 21 and 27, and their respective dependents.

Conclusions

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

A check in the amount of \$350.00 is enclosed to cover the fee for additional claims and a check in the amount of \$130.00 is enclosed to cover the fee for the Terminal Disclaimer. No other fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Todd A. Cason
Reg. No. 54,020

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6452

Date: 9/8/05

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number:

05073